UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/413,515	10/06/1999	JOHN R. SMITH	YO998-393	2108

7590   08/13/2004

ANNE VACHON DOUGHERTY
3173 CEDAR ROAD
YORKTOWN HEIGHTS, NY   10598

EXAMINER
DO, ANH HONG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2624	

DATE MAILED: 08/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>27 May 2004</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-29* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-29* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-29 have been considered

but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described
> as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to
> be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been
> obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which
> said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the
> invention was made.

3.   Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Hoffert et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,903,892) in view of Acharya et al.

("Compressed Domain Transcoding of MPEG").

Regarding claim 1, Hoffert ('892) discloses:

- analyzing the content of the multimedia presentation (col. 3, lines 5-6

teaches analyzing the media file's content and presenting summaries of the

analyzed content to users).

Hoffert ('892) does not disclose expressly performing transcoding based

on said analyzing.

Acharya discloses performing transcoding based on said analyzing (page

295, right column, last paragraph, teaches transcoding a MPEG-1 video file).

Hoffert ('892) & Acharaya are combinable because they are from video

compression.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to perform transcoding the analyzed multimedia content in Hoffert ('892) as taught by Acharya.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to obtain high speed transcoding at the price of lower picture quality (Acharya, Abstract).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hoffert ('892) with Acharya to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

Regarding claims 2, 26 and 28, Acharya teaches selecting at least one transcoding alternative (page 295, right column, paragraphs 1-4, teaches selecting either transcoding a media file from a H.261 format to a MJPEG file format or from MPEG-1 to MJPEG format; and performing transcoding the content according to said at least one transcoding alternative, i.e., transcoding MPEG-1 to MJPEG).

Regarding claim 3, Acharya teaches selecting less than all of said content for transcoding and transcoding less than all of said content (page 297, right column, paragraph 2, teaches selecting P and Bi macroblocks, which less than the entire content of the video file, and transcoding those macroblocks).

Regarding claims 4 and 5, Hoffert ('892) teaches separating a multimedia document into individual multimedia object and analyzing each multimedia object individually (col. 3, lines 9-17 teaches separating a multimedia document into individual multimedia object from media files by indexing them, and analyzing each multimedia object individually by examining them).

Regarding claims 6 and 7, Hoffert ('892) teaches identifying relationships between multimedia objects within a multimedia document (Fig. 4C: step 421), and Acharya teaches transcoding the related elements/objects as a group (page 297, right column, last paragraph, teaches transcoding individual bocks in combination or group).

Regarding claim 8, Hoffert ('892) teaches wherein the multimedia content is a document published on the World-Wide Web (col. 4, lines 53-60, teaches media file is a document published on web pages).

Regarding claim 9, Hoffert ('892) teaches the multimedia comprises visual content (col. 24, lines 1-8).

Regarding claim 10, Hoffert ('892) teaches the visual content is classified as an image type (col. 24, lines 1-8).

Regarding claim 11, Hoffert ('892) teaches a decision tree for classifying images into image type classes (col. 5, lines 52-59, teaches a search query with zero hits and col. 6, lines 1-2, teaches user classify the images into type classes by enhancing the indexing of the search materials).

Regarding claim 12, Hoffert ('892) teaches color photos, color graphics, gray graphics, black and white photos, and black and white graphics (col. 12, lines 42-60, teaches color photos and graphics; and col. 19, lines 61-62, teaches block and white photos and graphics).

Regarding claim 13, Hoffert ('892) teaches extracting color and texture features from the images (col. 22, lines 30-33).

Regarding claims 14 and 15, Hoffert ('892) teaches the image classification is used to select from different methods for compression (col. 22, lines 57-61), size and color reduction (col. 22, lines 49-52), substitution and removal (col. 21, lines 45-49).

Regarding claim 16, Acharya teaches the transcoder adapts the content to display, processing and storage constraints of the client devices (page 295, right column, paragraph 3, teaches transcoding adapts the content to edit (i.e., display), processing, and storage).

Regarding claim 17, Hoffert ('892) teaches adapting the content to the bandwidth and connectivity constraints of the network (col. 19, lines 36-39).

Regarding claim 18, Hoffert ('892) teaches the client device is a browser (col. 23, line 1-2).

Regarding claim 19, Hoffert ('892) teaches the client device is a hand-held computer (col. 28, lines 30-37, teaches a computer).

Regarding claim 20, Hoffert ('892) teaches intranet sites which can implicitly be accessed by phone (col. 3, lines 1-3).

Regarding claims 21 and 22, Hoffert ('892) teaches the network connection uses a wireless link to the client device (col. 3, lines 50-54).

Regarding claims 23 and 24, Hoffert ('892) teaches selecting an alternative version of data (col. 24, lines 3-11, teaches selecting alternative version of data, such as images, waveforms, or filmstrips).

Regarding claim 25, since this system claims corresponds to method claim 1, the discussion of claim 1 applies hereto.

Regarding claim 27, Hoffert ('892) teaches a computer program of instructions (col. 28, lines 30-37) to perform the steps in claim 1 and accordingly the discussion of claim 1 applies hereto.

Regarding claim 29, Hoffert ('892) teaches the content analysis results stored embedded with the multimedia content (col. 26, lines 33-40).

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANH H DO whose telephone number is 703-308-6720. The examiner can normally be reached on 5/4-9.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, DAVID K MOORE can be reached on 703-308-7452. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

August 9, 2004.

ANH HONG DO
PRIMARY EXAMINER